

Nicola A. Pisano (State Bar No. 151282)
napisano@jonesday.com
Jose L. Patiño (State Bar No. 149568)
jlpatino@jonesday.com
JONES DAY
12265 El Camino Real
Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92130
Telephone: 858.314.1200
Facsimile: 858.314.1150

Attorneys for Plaintiff ESET, LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ESET, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

LODSYS, LLC,

Defendant.

CASE NO. **'11CV1285 WQHRBB**

COMPLAINT FOR
DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

Plaintiff ESET, LLC ("ESET") hereby alleges for its Complaint for Declaratory Judgment against Defendant Lodsys, LLC ("Defendant") as follows:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is an action for a declaratory judgment that ESET does not infringe any valid claim of United States Patent Nos. 5,999,908 ("the '908 patent"), 7,133,834 ("the '834 patent"), 7,222,078 ("the '078 patent") or 7,620,565 ("the '565 patent") (collectively, the "Asserted

1 Patents”), and for a declaratory judgment that the claims of each of the Asserted patent are
2 invalid.

3 2. A true and correct copy of the ‘908 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

4 3. A true and correct copy of the ‘834 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

5 4. A true and correct copy of the ‘078 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

6 5. A true and correct copy of the ‘565 patent is attached hereto as Exhibit D.

7
8 **THE PARTIES**

9 6. Plaintiff ESET is a California Limited Liability Corporation having a place of
10 business at 610 W Ash Street, Suite 1900, San Diego, California 92101.

11 7. On information and belief, Lodsys is a Texas limited liability company having a
12 place of business at 505 East Travis Street, Suite 207, Marshall, Texas 75670.

13
14 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

15 8. This action arises under the Patent Laws of the United States, Title 35, United
16 States Code 35 U.S.C. § 1, et seq., and under the Federal Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§
17 2201 and 2202. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
18 §§ 1331, 1338(a), 2201 and 2202.

19 9. This action is filed to resolve an actual and justiciable controversy between the
20 parties hereto. Defendant’s conduct towards ESET establishes that a real and substantial dispute
21 exists between the parties regarding Defendant’s allegations that ESET’s products infringe the
22 ‘908 patent, the ‘834 patent, the ‘078 patent and/or the ‘565 patent. This dispute is both definite
23 and concrete and admits of specific relief through a decree of a conclusive character. As set forth
24 in succeeding paragraphs herein, there is a conflict of asserted rights among the parties and an
25 actual controversy exists between ESET and the Defendant with respect to the infringement,
26 validity and scope of the ‘908 patent, the ‘834 patent, the ‘078 patent and the ‘565 patent.
27
28

1 10. Upon information and belief, this Court has personal jurisdiction over Lodsys
2 because Lodsys has purposefully availed itself of the benefits and protections of the laws of this
3 State, including this Judicial District, in connection with its conduct in wrongfully asserting the
4 Asserted Patents against ESET, and in pursuing licensing and enforcement activities regarding the
5 Asserted Patents throughout California.
6

7 11. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and/or 1400.

8 **ALLEGATIONS SUPPORTING DECLARATORY JUDGMENT JURISDICTION**

9 12. ESET realleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation
10 contained in paragraphs 1-11.

11 13. Through communications and conduct, Defendant has repeatedly threatened
12 assertion of the ‘908 patent, the ‘834 patent, the ‘078 patent and/or the ‘565 patent against
13 ESET’s NOD32 Antivirus 4 product.
14

15 14. On or about March 28, 2011, Defendant sent a letter to ESET alleging that ESET
16 “is infringing at least claim 1 of US 7,620,565 and claim 1 of US 7,222,078 as it relates to your
17 provision of notice of available product updates and assisting in the download and installation of
18 those updates with respect to your ESET NOD32 Antivirus 4.” The March 28, 2011 letter also
19 offered a license to ESET under “the Lodsys Patents,” which was defined as including the ‘908
20 patent, the ‘834 patent, the ‘078 patent and the ‘565 patent. A copy of the March 28, 2011 letter
21 is included as attached Exhibit E.
22

23 15. On June 7, 2011, Defendant sent ESET an e-mail message enclosing an
24 “Infringement Claim Chart” in which Defendant alleged that ESET’s Smart Security 4 product
25 infringed claim 1 of the ‘078 patent. Defendant’s message enclosing the claim chart stated that
26 Defendant’s goal was “resolving this issue with a minimum of expense and hassle for your
27
28

1 client.” A copy of the June 7, 2011 e-mail and “Infringement Claim Chart” are included in the
2 attached Exhibit F.

3
4 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

5 **(Declaratory Judgment of Non-infringement of the ‘908 patent)**

6 16. ESET realleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation
7 contained in paragraphs 1-15.

8 17. Based on the above-stated conduct, ESET is informed and believes, and on that
9 basis avers, the Defendant contends that ESET’s NOD32 Antivirus and Smart Security 4
10 products infringe one or more claims of the ‘908 patent.

11 18. Accordingly, an actual controversy exists between ESET and the Defendant as to
12 whether or not ESET has infringed, or is infringing the ‘908 patent; has contributed to
13 infringement, or is contributing to infringement of the ‘908 patent; and has induced infringement,
14 or is inducing infringement of the ‘908 patent.

15 19. The controversy is such that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 57 and
16 28 U.S.C. § 2201 et seq., ESET is entitled to a declaration, in the form of a judgment, that by its
17 activities ESET has not infringed and is not infringing any valid and enforceable claim of the
18 ‘908 patent; has not contributed to infringement and is not contributing to infringement of the
19 ‘908 patent; and/or has not induced infringement and is not inducing infringement of the ‘908
20 patent. Such a determination and declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time.

21
22 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

23 **(Declaratory Judgment of Non-infringement of the ‘834 patent)**

24 20. ESET realleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation
25 contained in paragraphs 1-19.
26
27
28

1 27. The controversy is such that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 57 and
2 28 U.S.C. § 2201 et seq., ESET is entitled to a declaration, in the form of a judgment, that by its
3 activities ESET has not infringed and is not infringing any valid and enforceable claim of the
4 ‘078 patent; has not contributed to infringement and is not contributing to infringement of the
5 ‘078 patent; and/or has not induced infringement and is not inducing infringement of the ‘078
6 patent. Such a determination and declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time.
7

8 **FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

9 **(Declaratory Judgment of Non-infringement of the ‘565 patent)**

10 28. ESET realleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation
11 contained in paragraphs 1-27.

12 29. Based on the above-stated conduct, ESET is informed and believes, and on that
13 basis avers, that the Defendant contends that ESET’s NOD32 Antivirus and Smart Security 4
14 products infringe one or more claims of the ‘565 patent.
15

16 30. Accordingly, an actual controversy exists between ESET and the Defendant as to
17 whether or not ESET has infringed, or is infringing the ‘565 patent; has contributed to
18 infringement, or is contributing to infringement of the ‘565 patent; and has induced infringement,
19 or is inducing infringement of the ‘565 patent.
20

21 31. The controversy is such that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 57 and
22 28 U.S.C. § 2201 et seq., ESET is entitled to a declaration, in the form of a judgment, that by its
23 activities ESET has not infringed and is not infringing any valid and enforceable claim of the
24 ‘565 patent; has not contributed to infringement and is not contributing to infringement of the
25 ‘565 patent; and has not induced infringement and is not inducing infringement of the ‘565
26 patent. Such a determination and declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time.
27
28

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the '908 patent)

32. ESET realleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1-31.

33. Based on the above-stated conduct, ESET is informed and believes, and on that basis avers, that the Defendant contends that ESET infringes one or more claims of the '908 patent.

34. ESET denies that it infringes any valid and enforceable claim of the '908 patent, and avers that the assertions of infringement cannot be maintained consistently with statutory conditions of patentability and the statutory requirements for disclosure and claiming that must be satisfied for patent validity under at least one of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112.

35. Accordingly, an actual controversy exists between ESET and the Defendant as to the validity of the '908 patent. The controversy is such that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 57 and 28 U.S.C. § 2201 et seq., ESET is entitled to a declaration, in the form of a judgment, that the '908 patent is invalid. Such a determination and declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time.

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the '834 patent)

36. ESET realleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1-35.

37. Based on the above-stated conduct, ESET is informed and believes, and on that basis avers, that the Defendant contends that ESET infringes one or more claims of the '834 patent.

1 38. ESET denies that it infringes any valid and enforceable claim of the '834 patent,
2 and avers that the assertions of infringement cannot be maintained consistently with statutory
3 conditions of patentability and the statutory requirements for disclosure and claiming that must be
4 satisfied for patent validity under at least one of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112.

5
6 39. Accordingly, an actual controversy exists between ESET and the Defendant as to
7 the validity of the '834 patent. The controversy is such that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil
8 Procedure 57 and 28 U.S.C. § 2201 et seq., ESET is entitled to a declaration, in the form of a
9 judgment, that the '834 patent is invalid. Such a determination and declaration is necessary and
10 appropriate at this time.

11 **SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

12 **(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the '078 patent)**

13
14 40. ESET realleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation
15 contained in paragraphs 1-39.

16 41. Based on the above-stated conduct, ESET is informed and believes, and on that
17 basis avers, that the Defendant contends that ESET infringes one or more claims of the '078
18 patent.

19 42. ESET denies that it infringes any valid and enforceable claim of the '078 patent,
20 and avers that the assertions of infringement cannot be maintained consistently with statutory
21 conditions of patentability and the statutory requirements for disclosure and claiming that must be
22 satisfied for patent validity under at least one of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112.

23
24 43. Accordingly, an actual controversy exists between ESET and the Defendant as to
25 the validity of the '078 patent. The controversy is such that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil
26 Procedure 57 and 28 U.S.C. § 2201 et seq., ESET is entitled to a declaration, in the form of a
27
28

1 judgment, that the '078 patent is invalid. Such a determination and declaration is necessary and
2 appropriate at this time.

3 **EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

4 **(Declaratory Judgment of Invalidity of the '565 patent)**

5 44. ESET realleges and incorporates herein by reference each and every allegation
6 contained in paragraphs 1-43.

7 45. Based on the above-stated conduct, ESET is informed and believes, and on that
8 basis avers, that the Defendant contends that ESET infringes one or more claims of the '565
9 patent.

10 46. ESET denies that it infringes any valid and enforceable claim of the '565 patent,
11 and avers that the assertions of infringement cannot be maintained consistently with statutory
12 conditions of patentability and the statutory requirements for disclosure and claiming that must be
13 satisfied for patent validity under at least one of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112.

14 47. Accordingly, an actual controversy exists between ESET and the Defendant as to
15 the validity of the '565 patent. The controversy is such that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil
16 Procedure 57 and 28 U.S.C. § 2201 et seq., ESET is entitled to a declaration, in the form of a
17 judgment, that the '565 patent is invalid. Such a determination and declaration is necessary and
18 appropriate at this time.

19 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

20 WHEREFORE, plaintiff ESET prays for a judgment as follows:

21 1. For a declaration that its products do not infringe any valid claim of the '908
22 patent;

23 2. For a declaration that assertions of infringement of the '908 patent cannot be
24 maintained consistently with statutory conditions of patentability and the statutory requirements
25

1 for disclosure and claiming that must be satisfied for patent validity under one or more of 35
2 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112;

3 3. For a declaration that the claims of the '908 patent are invalid under one or more
4 of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112;

5 4. For a declaration that its products do not infringe any valid claim of the '834
6 patent;

7 5. For a declaration that assertions of infringement of the '834 patent cannot be
8 maintained consistently with statutory conditions of patentability and the statutory requirements
9 for disclosure and claiming that must be satisfied for patent validity under one or more of 35
10 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112;

11 6. For a declaration that the claims of the '834 patent are invalid under one or more
12 of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112;

13 7. For a declaration that its products do not infringe any valid claim of the '078
14 patent;

15 8. For a declaration that assertions of infringement of the '078 patent cannot be
16 maintained consistently with statutory conditions of patentability and the statutory requirements
17 for disclosure and claiming that must be satisfied for patent validity under one or more of 35
18 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112;

19 9. For a declaration that the claims of the '078 patent are invalid under one or more
20 of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112;

21 10. For a declaration that its products do not infringe any valid claim of the '565
22 patent;

23 11. For a declaration that assertions of infringement of the '565 patent cannot be
24 maintained consistently with statutory conditions of patentability and the statutory requirements
25
26
27
28

1 for disclosure and claiming that must be satisfied for patent validity under one or more of 35
2 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112;

3 12. For a declaration that the claims of the '565 patent are invalid under one or more
4 of 35 U.S.C. §§ 101, 102, 103, and 112;

5 13. For a preliminary and permanent injunction enjoining and restraining Defendant
6 and its respective officers, partners, employees, agents, parents, subsidiaries or anyone in privity
7 with them, and all persons acting in concert with them and each of them:
8

9 a. from making any claims to any person or entity that any product of ESET infringes
10 the '908 patent, the '834 patent, the '078 patent and/or the '565 patent;

11 b. from interfering with, or threatening to interfere with the manufacture, sale, or use
12 of any ESET's products by ESET, its customers, distributors, predecessors, successors or
13 assigns; and
14

15 c. from instituting or prosecuting any lawsuit or proceeding, placing in issue the right
16 of ESET, its customers, distributors, predecessors, successors or assigns, to make, use or
17 sell products which allegedly infringe the '908 patent, the '834 patent, the '078 patent
18 and/or the '565 patent.

19 14. For an award to ESET of its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred
20 herein; and
21

22 15. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.
23
24
25
26
27
28

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff respectfully requests a trial by jury of all issues so triable.

Dated: June 10, 2011

JONES DAY

By: /s/ Nicola A. Pisano
Nicola A. Pisano

Attorneys for Plaintiff
ESET, LLC

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

ESET, LLC

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff San Diego, CA

(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

Nicola A. Pisano, JONES DAY

12265 El Camino Real, Ste. 200, San Diego, CA 92130

DEFENDANTS

LODSYS, LLC

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Harrison, TX

(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

Kelley, Donion, Gill, Huck & Goldfarb LLC

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 6800, Seattle, WA 98104

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION

(Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
- ☒ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
- ☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant
- ☒ 4 Diversity - yeb (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES

(For Diversity Cases Only)

- | | PTF | DEF | | PTF | DEF |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Citizen of This State | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | Incorporated <i>or</i> Principal Place of Business In This State | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| Citizen of Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | Incorporated <i>and</i> Principal Place of Business In Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | Foreign Nation | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 |

IV. NATURE OF SUIT

(Place an "X" in One Box Only)

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise	PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice <input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY <input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending <input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 610 Agriculture <input type="checkbox"/> 620 Other Food & Drug <input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 630 Liquor Laws <input type="checkbox"/> 640 R.R. & Truck <input type="checkbox"/> 650 Airline Regs. <input type="checkbox"/> 660 Occupational Safety/Health <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other LABOR <input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY <input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	<input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations <input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit <input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV <input type="checkbox"/> 810 Selective Service <input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange <input type="checkbox"/> 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 <input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions <input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts <input type="checkbox"/> 892 Economic Stabilization Act <input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 894 Energy Allocation Act <input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act <input type="checkbox"/> 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
REAL PROPERTY <input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation <input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment <input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land <input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property	CIVIL RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/Accommodations <input type="checkbox"/> 444 Welfare <input type="checkbox"/> 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other <input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PETITIONS <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus: <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition		

V. ORIGIN

(Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☒ 1 Original Proceeding ☐ 2 Removed from State Court ☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court ☐ 4 Reinstated or Reopened ☐ 5 Transferred from another district (specify) ☐ 6 Multidistrict Litigation ☐ 7 Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):

35 U.S.C. Sec. 1 et seq., 28 U.S.C. Secs. 2201 and 2202

Brief description of cause:

Declaratory Judgment of Noninfringement/Invalidity US Patent Nos. 5,999,908, 7,133,834, 7,222,078, 7,620,565

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23

DEMAND \$

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:

JURY DEMAND: ☒ Yes ☐ No**VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY**

(See instructions):

JUDGE

DOCKET NUMBER

DATE

06/10/2011

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

/s/ Nicola A. Pisano

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # _____ AMOUNT _____ APPLYING IFP _____ JUDGE _____ MAG. JUDGE _____